

Refresh: Complete these laws

`(append ' () zs) == ...`

`(append (cons y ys) zs) == ...`

`(reverse ' ()) == ...`

`(reverse (cons y ys)) == ...`

Refresh: Complete these laws

Waiting...

Refresh: Complete these laws

`(append ' () zs) == zs`

`(append (cons y ys) zs) == (cons y (append ys zs))`

`(reverse ' ()) == ' ()`

`(reverse (cons y ys)) == (append (reverse ys)
(list1 y))`

Impcore: Things that should offend you

Look up function vs look up variable:

- **Different interfaces!**

To get variable, check multiple environments

Create a function? Must give it a name

- **High cognitive overhead**
- **A sign of second-class citizenship**

Scheme simplifies names

Simpler naming:

- Name stands for a **mutable location**
- Location holds values, updated with `set`
- Function is just another value

New Evaluation Judgment

Judgment $\langle e, \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle v, \sigma' \rangle$

- Mappings in ρ never change
- ρ maps a name to a mutable location
- σ is the **store** (contents of every location)

Intuition of the compiler writer:

- ρ models the compiler's "symbol table"
- σ models the contents of registers and memory

Classic semantic technique

μ Scheme vs Impcore

New abstract syntax:

LET (keyword, names, expressions, body)

LAMBDA λ (formals, body)

APPLY (**exp**, actuals)

Introduce local names into environment

```
(let ([x1 e1]  
      ...  
      [xn en])  
  e)
```

Square brackets mean the same as round, but are easier to see

What McCarthy might have done

```
(let ([val x1 e1]  
      ...  
      [val xn en])  
  e)
```

(But semantics of `let`, `let*`, `letrec` is much simpler)

Semantics of let binding

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \langle e_1, \rho, \sigma_0 \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_1, \sigma_1 \rangle \\ \langle e_2, \rho, \sigma_1 \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_2, \sigma_2 \rangle \\ \ell_1, \ell_2 \notin \text{dom } \sigma_2 \\ \langle e, \rho \{x_1 \mapsto \ell_1, x_2 \mapsto \ell_2\}, \sigma_2 \{ \ell_1 \mapsto v_1, \ell_2 \mapsto v_2 \} \rangle \Downarrow \langle v, \sigma' \rangle \end{array}}{\langle \text{LET}(\langle x_1, e_1, x_2, e_2 \rangle, e), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle v, \sigma' \rangle} \quad (\text{LET2})$$

Function escapes!

```
-> (define to-the-n-minus-k (n k)
      (let
        ([x-to-the-n-minus-k (lambda (x)
                               (- (exp x n) k))])
          x-to-the-n-minus-k))
-> (val x-cubed-minus-27 (to-the-n-minus-k 3 27))
-> (x-cubed-minus-27 2)
-19
```

No need to name the escaping function

```
-> (define to-the-n-minus-k (n k)
      (lambda (x) (- (exp x n) k)))
```

```
-> (val x-cubed-minus-27 (to-the-n-minus-k 3 27))
```

```
-> (x-cubed-minus-27 2)
```

```
-19
```

The zero-finder

```
(define findzero-between (f lo hi)
  ; binary search
  (if (>= (+ lo 1) hi)
      hi
      (let ([mid (/ (+ lo hi) 2)])
        (if (< (f mid) 0)
            (findzero-between f mid hi)
            (findzero-between f lo mid))))))
(define findzero (f) (findzero-between f 0 100))
```

Cube root of 27 and square root of 16

```
-> (findzero (to-the-n-minus-k 3 27))
```

```
3
```

```
-> (findzero (to-the-n-minus-k 2 16))
```

```
4
```

Lambda questions

```
(define combine (p? q?)  
  (lambda (x) (if (p? x) (q? x) #f)))
```

```
(define divvy (p? q?)  
  (lambda (x) (if (p? x) #t (q? x))))
```

```
(val c-p-e (combine prime? even?))
```

```
(val d-p-o (divvy prime? odd?))
```

```
(c-p-e 9) == ?
```

```
(d-p-o 9) == ?
```

```
(c-p-e 8) == ?
```

```
(d-p-o 8) == ?
```

```
(c-p-e 7) == ?
```

```
(d-p-o 7) == ?
```

Lambda answers

```
(define combine (p? q?)  
  (lambda (x) (if (p? x) (q? x) #f)))
```

```
(define divvy (p? q?)  
  (lambda (x) (if (p? x) #t (q? x))))
```

```
(val c-p-e (combine prime? even?))
```

```
(val d-p-o (divvy prime? odd?))
```

```
(c-p-e 9) == #f
```

```
(d-p-o 9) == #t
```

```
(c-p-e 8) == #f
```

```
(d-p-o 8) == #f
```

```
(c-p-e 7) == #f
```

```
(d-p-o 7) == #t
```


Algebraic laws when functions escape

Laws have **nested applications on left-hand side**:

```
( (combine p? q?) x ) == (if (p? x) (q? x) #f)
```

```
( (divvy p? q?) x ) == (if (p? x) #t (q? x))
```

One application for each `define` **or** `lambda`

Good place for syntactic sugar (short-circuit operators):

```
( (combine p? q?) x ) == ( && (p? x) (q? x) )
```

```
( (divvy p? q?) x ) == ( || (p? x) (q? x) )
```

Semantics of Lambda

Key Issue: Values of free variables

Static scoping:

Where `lambda` occurs, “look outward” for ρ ;
Capture that ρ for future reference.

$$\langle \text{LAMBDA}(\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle, e), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle (\text{LAMBDA}(\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle, e), \rho), \sigma \rangle$$

(MKCLOSURE)

Create closure in C implementation of `eval` by

case LAMBDA:

```
return mkClosure(e->u.lambdax, env);
```

Applying Closures (Two Arguments)

Captured environment for free variables

Arguments for bound variables (\equiv formal parameters)

$$\begin{array}{c} \langle e, \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \langle \text{LAMBDA}(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, e_c), \rho_c \rangle, \sigma_0 \rangle \\ \langle e_1, \rho, \sigma_0 \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_1, \sigma_1 \rangle \\ \langle e_2, \rho, \sigma_1 \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_2, \sigma_2 \rangle \\ \ell_1, \ell_2 \notin \text{dom } \sigma_2 \\ \hline \langle e_c, \rho_c \{x_1 \mapsto \ell_1, x_2 \mapsto \ell_2\}, \sigma_2 \{ \ell_1 \mapsto v_1, \ell_2 \mapsto v_2 \} \rangle \Downarrow \langle v, \sigma' \rangle \\ \langle \text{APPLY}(e, e_1, e_2), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle v, \sigma' \rangle \\ \text{(APPLYCLOSURE2)} \end{array}$$

```
xs = f.u.closure.lambda.formals;
return eval(f.u.closure.lambda.body,
            bindalloclist(xs, vs, f.u.closure.env));
```